



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|

10/065,528

10/26/2002

Carl Michael Dennison

BLD920010032

2146

33595

7590

08/12/2005

INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS MACHINES CORPORATION
9000 SOUTH RITA ROAD
TUCSON, AZ 85744

EXAMINER

HUNTSINGER, PETER K

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2624

DATE MAILED: 08/12/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/065,528

Applicant(s)

DENNISON ET AL.

Examiner

Peter K. Huntsinger

Art Unit

2624

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-42 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-42 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 26 October 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claim 4 is objected to because of the following informalities: The term "additional ob ticket" on line 5 of the claim should be replaced with "additional job ticket".

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1-3, 6, 15-17, 20, 29-31, and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Robinson et al. Publication US 2002,0080402.

Referring to claims 1, 15, and 29, Robinson et al. disclose a method comprising the steps: creating a first job ticket describing print instructions applicable to a first print job (super ticket of Fig. 1, page 5, paragraph 64); creating at least one additional job ticket describing different print instructions applicable to the first print job (individual ticket of Fig. 1, page 5, paragraph 64); storing each job ticket (264 of Fig. 4, page 6, paragraph 86).

Referring to claims 2, 16, and 30, Robinson et al. disclose the method according to claim 1 wherein the step of creating at least one additional job ticket comprises creating a plurality of additional job tickets (individual tickets of Fig. 4, page 6, paragraph 86).

Referring to claims 3, 17, and 31, Robinson et al. disclose the method of claim 1 wherein the steps of creating the first job ticket and the at least one additional job ticket are performed using a visual job ticketing application (page 5, paragraph 67).

Referring to claims 6, 20, and 34, Robinson et al. disclose the method of claim 1 wherein the step of storing each job ticket comprises storing an indication of which job ticket was last active with respect to the first print job (page 5, paragraph 73) (page 6, paragraph 86). Robinson et al. disclose that after a ticket is activated, the master ticket is marked. The last ticket to be activated would be stored last on the marked list within the master ticket. Furthermore, the print tickets when activated are viewed as separate jobs to the system, which would maintain an order of the tickets (page 5, paragraph 69).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claim 4, 5, 7-14, 18, 19, 21-28, 32, 33, and 35-42 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Robinson et al. Publication US 2002,0080402

as applied to claims 1 and 2 above, and further in view of Suzuki et al. U.S. Patent 5,923,013.

Referring to claims 4, 5, 18, 19, 32, and 33, Robinson et al. disclose altering the first print job and automatically amending the print instructions of the first and of the plurality of additional job tickets appropriately to account for the alteration of the first print job (page 7, paragraph 90). Robinson et al. does not disclose expressly moving, inserting, or deleting a page in the print job. Suzuki et al. disclose altering a first print job by moving, inserting or deleting at least one page in the first print job (Fig. 52, col. 10, lines 14-18). Robinson et al. and Suzuki et al. are combinable because they are from the same field of managing print job description files. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to amend job tickets globally after a page is added to print job that the tickets describe. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow multiple print tickets to be easily modified without individually edited each ticket and inserting a divider page to separate page sections. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Suzuki et al. with Robinson et al. to obtain the invention as specified in claims 4, 5, 18, 19, 32, and 33.

Referring to claims 7, 8, 21, 22, 35, and 36, Robinson et al. disclose automatically amending the print instructions of the first job ticket and of the plurality of additional job tickets appropriately to account for the alteration of the first print job (page 7, paragraph 90). Robinson et al. do not disclose expressly importing a page from a second print job into the first print job. Suzuki et al. disclose importing at least one page from a second print job into the first print job (Fig. 26, col. 15, lines 7-13); and choosing

to retain the print characteristics of the at least one imported page as defined in the job ticket associated with the second print job (Fig. 50, col. 23, lines 32-44). Robinson et al. and Suzuki et al. are combinable because they are from the same field of managing print job description files. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to retain the print characteristics of a second print job page imported into a first print job described by print tickets. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow the user to specify whether a description file of a print job or a description file of an inserted page should be used to specify the characteristics of the inserted page. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Suzuki et al. with Robinson et al. to obtain the invention as specified in claims 7, 8, 21, 22, 35, and 36.

Referring to claims 9, 10, 23, 24, 37, and 38, Robinson et al. disclose automatically amending the print instructions of the first job ticket and of the plurality of additional job tickets appropriately to account for the alteration of the first print job (page 7, paragraph 90). Robinson et al. do not disclose expressly importing a page from a second print job into the first print job. Suzuki et al. disclose importing at least one page from a second print job into the first print job (Fig. 26, col. 15, lines 7-13); and choosing to assign a default set of print characteristics to the at least one imported page corresponding to a set of document-wide print characteristics defined in a currently active job ticket associated with the first print job (Fig. 51, col. 23, lines 45-54). Robinson et al. and Suzuki et al. are combinable because they are from the same field of managing print job description files. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to amend the print characteristics of a

Art Unit: 2624

second print job page imported into a first print job described by print tickets. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow the user to specify whether a description file of a print job or a description file of an inserted page should be used to specify the characteristics of the inserted page. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Suzuki et al. with Robinson et al. to obtain the invention as specified in claims 9, 10, 23, 24, 37, and 38.

Referring to claims 11, 13, 25, 27, 39, and 41, Robinson et al. disclose wherein the step of creating at least one additional job ticket comprises: choosing one from among; loading a blank job ticket as the active job ticket (page 6, paragraph 80); loading a selected, previously-created job ticket as the active job ticket (page 6, paragraph 77); retaining the first job ticket as the active job ticket (224 of Fig. 3, page 6, paragraph 77) and editing the print characteristics of the active job ticket to create the at least one additional job ticket (page 6, paragraph 77). The active job ticket is represented as being the ticket of which the user is currently editing. Robinson et al. does not disclose expressly loading a default job ticket as the active job ticket. Suzuki et al. disclose loading a default job ticket as the active job ticket (Fig. 4, col. 7, lines 18-23). Robinson et al. and Suzuki et al. are combinable because they are from the same field of managing print job description files. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to load default job ticket as the active ticket. The motivation for doing so would have been to designate a standard of which print characteristics to apply for a print ticket. Further, as disclosed by Robinson et al., checked boxes showing print characteristics must either be checked or unchecked. The

Art Unit: 2624

settings that appear when create a new job ticket would clearly be a default setting.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Suzuki et al. with Robinson et al. to obtain the invention as specified in claims 11, 13, 25, 27, 39, and 41.

Referring to claim 12, 14, 26, 28, 40, and 42, Robinson et al. disclose wherein the editing step is performed using a visual ticketing application (page 3, paragraph 38) whereby the first print job is displayed using visual cues indicating the print characteristics denoted by the active job ticket, as edited (checked boxes of Fig. 1, page 5, paragraph 73).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Peter K. Huntsinger whose telephone number is (571)272-7435. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Moore can be reached on (571)272-7437. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2624

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

PKH



DAVID MOORE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600